

REMARKS

Claims 12-23 are now in this application. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected. Claims 1-9 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1-11 are cancelled herein. New claims 12-23 are added.

The Examiner has suggested a new title. Applicant has amended the specification to recite the title "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR MANUFACTURING A FOLDING TOP FOR A CONVERTIBLE." It is respectfully submitted that the new title is sufficiently descriptive of the invention.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for including references to the claims. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Preliminary Amendment (A), filed April 30, 2002, wherein the reference to the claims was deleted. The Examiner further objects to a typographical error. In order to facilitate prosecution, applicant submits herewith a substitute specification and abstract wherein amendments are effected to place the text thereof into proper English in accordance with 37 CFR 1.125(c). The amendments include those made in the Preliminary Amendment. Also accompanying this amendment is a reproduction of the original specification and abstract with markings indicating the amendments effected in the substitute specification in accordance with MPEP §608.01(q) and 37 CFR 1.125(b).

No new matter is added. Entry of the substitute specification and abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 10 and 11 are now cancelled rendering the rejection under §112, second paragraph moot. Claims 12-26 are added. It is respectfully submitted that claims 12-26 particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter of the invention. Allowance of claims 12-26 is earnestly requested.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected as obvious over the Stoltz '844 reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claims 10 and 11 are now cancelled rendering the rejection moot. However, insofar as the subject matter of new claims 12-26 reflects that of the cancelled claims and in the event the Examiner considers asserting the present rejection against the new claims, applicants submit the following remarks.

Claim 12 provides for a first heat applying step wherein the inner peripheral region of the covering strip, the first and second peripheral window edge regions, and the frame region are bonded together. This permits the alignment of the frame

region and the first peripheral window edge region to be secured before further processing is executed. After this bonding, the bonding of the outer peripheral region of the covering strip and the outer frame region is effectuated. This is accomplished by the first and second electrodes being movable in alternation. Such a practice is not disclosed by the Stolz reference.

The Stolz reference requires the support band 6 to be first secured, a windowpane then inserted, and the other support band 7 be zippered to the support band 6 to hold the windowpane in place. This is contrary to the method of assembly of the present invention.

With regard to claims 13, the Stolz reference is devoid of the teaching of holding elements which secure the window in the first heat applying step and which are then disengaged in a second heat applying step. Disengaging of the holding elements allows the outer peripheral region of the covering strip and the outer frame region to be bonded. Since the Stolz reference bonds support band 6 before introducing the windowpane, one skilled in the art would not be led to the aforementioned aspect of the present invention.

Turning to claims 16 and 21-23, the mounting holding elements being in a movable subassembly for aligning the window pane is clearly not taught by the Stolz reference. Apparently, the Stolz reference relies on the support bands 6 and 7 to effect alignment.

Finally, with regard to claims 17 and 18, the Stolz reference provides no teaching that lead one to providing an electrode having a step configuration for accepting a fold.

Applicant respectfully requests a three month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$950.00 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants
and,

By Herbert F. Ruschmann
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Substitute Specification; and Marked reproduction of original specification.